

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP
Attorneys at Law507 Canyon Boulevard, Suite 201
Boulder, Colorado 80302
Telephone (720) 406-0506 • Facsimile (720) 406-0520**RECEIVED**
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**MAY 10 2006**DATE: MAY 10, 2006
TO: RAQUEL ALVAROZ
FAX NO.: 571-273-8300SERIAL NO.: 10/001,662
OUR DOCKET NO.: 42059-01380
GROUP ART NO.: 3622
FILING DATE: 10/18/2001
CONFIRMATION NO.: 4124FROM: GREG LETTIGDirect Dial #: (720) 562- 5308MESSAGE: AGENDA FOR PHONE INTERVIEW

Number of pages, including this cover sheet: 2Original to follow via mail: YES NO

If you need a confirmation or any of the pages sent again, please call our offices at the following number: 720-406-0506. If you do not call within 15 minutes, we will assume you have received the pages satisfactorily. SENT BY: Kimberly

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: The information contained in this facsimile transmittal sheet and document(s) that follow are for the exclusive use of the addressee and may contain confidential, privileged and nondisclosable information. If the recipient of this facsimile is not the addressee, or a person responsible for delivering this facsimile to the addressee, such recipient is strictly prohibited from reading, photocopying, distributing or otherwise using this facsimile transmission, or its contents, in any way. If the recipient has received this facsimile transmission in error, please call us immediately and return the facsimile transmission to us via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

MAY 10 2006

Proposed Agenda of Topics to Discuss in the 10/001,662 Claim Rejections

1. The applicant's disagreement with the examiner's assertion of displayed demographic information being taught by Rangan.
2. The applicant's disagreement with the examiner's assertion of IP address use to access a database of demographic information being taught by Rangan.
3. Rangan's express teachings away from the applicant's claims in Column 7, lines 14-27 (e.g., Rangan's teaching of transmission and insertion of hyperlinks into video content as opposed inserting a commercial into video content).
4. Rangan and Wachob being non analogous art.
5. The examiner's failure to address each of the applicant's claims in view of the new grounds for rejection (e.g., monitoring the system user of claim 4, detection based on ad hoc commercial breaks of claim 5, identifying appropriate commercials based on available time of claim 6, querying a system user for demographic information when the user logs on of claim 9, presenting an interactive component in the broadcast commercial of claim 10).
6. The examiner's official notice with respect to schedule databases but not addressing all of the elements of the claimed schedule database (i.e., storing screen displays).